UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,417	04/20/2004	Michael E. Bell	4480-65	2581
	7590 08/07/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	JUSKA, CHERYL		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/827,417	BELL, MICHAEL E.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheryl Juska	1771	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 c 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated the closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4)	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ction is required if the drawing(s) is objection	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's RCE filed July 18, 2007, has been entered. Accordingly, the amendment originally submitted as an Amendment After Final on June 14, 2007 has now been entered. Claims 15, 24, and 28 have been amended as requested. Claims 1-14, 16, 20, 25-27, and 32 have been cancelled. Thus, the pending claims are 15, 17-19, 21-24, and 28-31.

Terminal Disclaimer

3. As noted in the Advisory Action of June 27, 2007, the terminal disclaimer filed with the Amendment After Final on June 14, 2007, is sufficient to withdraw the double patenting rejection set forth in section 7 of the last Office Action (Final Rejection mailed 12/14/06).

Art Unit: 1771

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 15, 17-19, 21-24, and 28-31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 60-206868 issued to Moryama in view of WO 99/40250 issued to Chen as set forth in sections 9 and 10 of the last Office Action.

Applicant has amended independent claims 15, 24, and 28 to limit the step of "heating the first material to a temperature enabling the first material to flow, but not completely melted." However, said amendment is insufficient to overcome the standing prior art rejection. Specifically, Moryama teaches this new limitation in that the temperature of the melt extruding process is a temperature less than the melting point of the carpet material 2 (i.e., carpet fibers of waste carpet material including pile fibers 2b and fibers of base fabric 2a), but above the melting point of the backing material 3 from the waste carpet material and the added resin (Moryama translation, page 5, lines 17-31 and Figure 1). This produces a new carpet backing comprising unmelted carpet fibers 2 in a matrix of resin comprising the melted backing material and melted added resin (Figure 5). Therefore, Moryama clearly teaches the step of heating the first material (ground chips of waste carpeting) to a temperature enabling the first material to flow, but not completely melted (i.e., carpet fibers are not melted). Additionally, it is noted that an inorganic filler, such as the calcium carbonate taught by Chen, present in the backing material, would not

Art Unit: 1771

be melted at the disclosed extrusion temperature. Thus, claims 24 and 28-31 stand rejected as being obvious over the cited Moryama and Chen references.

With respect to claim 15, applicant has also amended the claim to limit the viscosity of the molten composite material to a range of 10,000-30,000 CPS. While the cited prior art fails to teach the claimed viscosity, the claims remain obvious over the prior art. In particular, the structural and chemical limitations of the claimed molten composite material are met by the cited prior art. As such, it is reasonable to presume that the present material has the same physical properties prior art material. Like materials cannot have mutually exclusive properties. In the alternative, it would have been readily obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to manipulate the molten composition in order to achieve the desired viscosity for extruding said composition into a carpet backing, so long as the temperature criteria of Moryama is maintained. Therefore, claims 15, 17-19, and 21-23 are also rejected.

Response to Arguments

- 6. Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 7. Applicant traverses the rejection of the claims over Moryama in view of Chen by asserting that Moryama requires the material to be completely melted, as opposed to the presently claimed invention (Amendment, paragraph spanning pages 6-7). However, as discussed above, Moryama does not require the carpet fibers of the waste carpet material to be melted. Hence, applicant's argument is found unpersuasive and the above rejection stands.

Art Unit: 1771

8. Applicant also traverses the rejection by asserting that neither Moryama nor Chen teach

or appreciate the claimed particle size range (Amendment, page 7, 1st paragraph). In response,

applicant is reminded that Chen teaches grinding waste carpet to a particle size ranging from 5-

1000 microns (Chen, page 18, claim 9). Thus, applicant's argument is found unpersuasive.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Cheryl Juska whose telephone number is 571-272-1477. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10am-6pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached

at 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Cheryl Juska/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771

C

August 7, 2007